

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 23 2006**

In re Application of HEILBRON et al.
Serial No. 09/609,001

any new historical relationships based on contemporaneous information.

Applicants submit that for at least this additional reason, claim 6 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Turning to the next independent claim, amended claim 13 recites a machine-readable medium having instructions stored thereon for execution by a client processor to perform a method comprising fetching a current web page, the current web page including one or more links, each link pointing to a web page, fetching contemporaneous information from each linked web page, the information regarding the web page to which each link points, wherein the information is stored separately from the current web page, assembling relational information based on the contemporaneously fetched information from each linked web page and based on previously stored historical information, the relational information including at least one newly generated historical relationship between the contemporaneously fetched information and the previously stored information regarding a user of the client-side computer, displaying the current web page, and displaying an informational region, in response to a cursor hovering over a particular link of the one or more links, the region including the contemporaneous information previously fetched regarding the web page to which the link points and the relational information previously assembled.

The Office action rejected claim 13 as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Becker, for identical reasons to those that the Office action detailed in the rejection of claim 1. However, claim 13 is somewhat similar to claim 1, and thus for

In re Application of HEILBRON et al.
Serial No. 09/609,001

at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 13 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 14-21 are allowable. Each of these claims depends either directly or indirectly from claim 13 and consequently includes the recitations of independent claim 13. As discussed above, Brown and Becker, whether considered individually or in any permissible combination with each other or any other prior art of record, fail to teach or suggest the recitations of claim 13 and, therefore, dependent claims 14-21 are also allowable over the prior art of record. In addition to the recitations of claim 13 noted above, each of these dependent claims includes additional patentable elements.

Turning to the next independent claim, amended claim 22 recites, a computerized system comprising at least one first entity storing web pages, at least one second entity separate from the first entity storing information regarding the web pages, and, at least one client, each client able to browse web pages such that fetching of a web page having one or more linked web pages from at least one first entity causes the fetching of contemporaneous information from each of the one or more linked web pages about the one or more linked web pages from at least one second entity and causes the assembling of relational information based on the contemporaneously fetched information and based on previously stored historical information, the relational information including at least one newly generated historical relationship between the contemporaneously fetched information and the previously stored information regarding a user of the client-side

In re Application of HEILBRON et al.
Serial No. 09/609,001

computer, the and the client further operable such that positioning of a cursor over a link of a current web page causes display of an informational region including information regarding a web page to which the link points as stored on the at least one second entity and causes display of the assembled relational information.

The Office action rejected claim 22 as being anticipated by Brown. Again, the Office action presented identical reasons in the rejection of claim 22 as were presented for the rejection of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As correctly acknowledged by the Office action, nowhere does Brown teach the concept of assembling historical relational information between the linked web pages and the user. Notwithstanding whether the contention that Becker may teach assembling some kind of historical data with regard to a user and a particular web site has any merit, Becker falls short of teaching or even suggesting generating a new relationship each time a user may come into contact with a particular web page such that the new relationship is based on not only the previously stored historical relationship but also contemporaneously retrieved new information. That is, neither Brown nor Becker teaches or suggests the concept of assembling relational information based on the contemporaneously fetched information and based on previously stored historical information, the relational information including at least one newly generated historical relationship between the contemporaneously fetched information and the previously stored information regarding a user of the client-side computer as recited in claim 22. For at least these additional reasons, applicants submit that claim 22 is allowable over the prior art of record.

In re Application of HEILBRON et al.
Serial No. 09/609,001

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 23-24 by similar analysis are allowable. Both of these claims depend directly from claim 22 and, consequently, include the recitations of independent claim 22. As discussed above, Brown and Becker, whether considered individually or in any permissible combination with each other or any other prior art of record, fail to teach or suggest the recitations of claim 22 and, therefore, these claims are also allowable over the prior art of record. In addition to the recitations of claim 22 noted above, each of these dependent claims includes additional patentable elements.

Turning to the last independent claim, amended claim 25 recites a computerized system comprising, at least one first entity capable of storing web pages, at least one second entity capable of providing summaries of the web pages, wherein the summaries include at least one historical relationship between a user of the first entity and a web page stored on the first entity, at least one third entity capable of providing for a given web page stored by the first entity, a list of all links on the web page and for each of the links, the corresponding summary, provided by the second entity, and, at least one client, each able to browse web pages such that fetching of a web page from the at least one first entity causes fetching contemporaneous information provided by the third entity and such that positioning of a cursor over a link of a current web page causes display of an informational region including at least one newly generated historical relationship that is based on previously stored historical information and the contemporaneously fetched information regarding a web page to which the link points.

In re Application of HEILBRON et al.
Serial No. 09/609,001

The Office action rejected claim 25 as being anticipated by Brown. Again, identical reasons were given in the rejection of claim 25 as were given for the rejection of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Once again, as correctly acknowledged by the Office action, nowhere does Brown teach the concept of assembling historical relational information between the linked web pages and the user. Regardless of whether Becker may or may not teach assembling some kind of historical data with regard to a user and a particular web site, the fact remains that Becker falls short of teaching or even suggesting generating any new relationships when a user may come into contact with a particular web page such that the new relationship is based on not only the previously stored historical relationship but also contemporaneously retrieved new information. This is because Becker does not teach gathering any new contemporaneous information from the newly accessed web page or web pages.

In terms of claim 25, neither Brown nor Becker teaches or suggests fetching contemporaneous information provided by the third entity and such that positioning of a cursor over a link of a current web page causes display of an informational region including at least one newly generated historical relationship that is based on previously stored historical information and the contemporaneously fetched information regarding a web page to which the link points. For at least these additional reasons, applicants submit that claim 25 is allowable over the prior art of record.

For at least the foregoing reasons in the remarks, applicants submit that all the claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and

**In re Application of HEILBRON et al.
Serial No. 09/609,001**

**withdrawal of the rejections in the Office action is respectfully requested and early
allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.**


In re Application of HEILBRON et al.
Serial No. 09/609,001

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are patentable over the prior art of record, and that the application is in good and proper form for allowance. A favorable action on the part of the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (425) 836-3030.

Respectfully submitted,



Albert S. Michalik, Reg. No. 37,395
Attorney for Applicants
Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC
704 - 228th Avenue NE, Suite 193
Sammamish, WA 98074
(425) 836-3030
(425) 836-8957 (facsimile)